

means as much as those who give thousands." With all due respect, Mr. President, this woman is typical of the people who deserve our best representation. Sadly, under the current campaign system, they rarely do.

I have tried to live by my word on this issue. My first Senate campaign was a shoestring affair. I was out spent nearly 3 to 1 by a congressional incumbent. But because I had a strong, grassroots, people-based effort, I was able to win.

Since then, I have worked hard to keep to that standard. I have over 20,000 individual donors. The average contribution to my campaign is \$42. Over 90 percent of my contributions come from within Washington State. I firmly believe that's the way campaigns should be run: by the people.

We need more disclosure, not less. We need more restrictions on special interest money, not fewer. We need less money in the system, not more. We need to amplify the voices of regular people, instead of allowing them to be shouted down by special interests.

Mr. President, I believe we have made this debate way too complicated. After all the maneuvering, the cloture petitions, the technicalities, the procedural votes, this issue boils down to one basic question: are Senators willing to make some modest reforms to reduce the influence of big money in politics and encourage greater voter participation? Or are they more interested in protecting the current system, and the ability of parties and politicians to turn financial advantage into political advantage?

Are you for reform, or against it? Are you with the people, or against them on the need for a more healthy democracy? The votes we are taking today will show the answers to these questions.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I think by unanimous consent I have the next 45 minutes reserved. I would like to yield the first 20 minutes, or 25 if he needs it, to the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. ROBERTS. Thank you, Mr. President. I wish to thank my colleague from Texas for reserving this time.

Mr. President, we are going to change the subject in regard to campaign reform. Let me just simply say that I think it is always a wise suggestion to check under the banner of what is alleged campaign reform, and I think if we would check under the banner in regards to the McCain-Feingold bill, that campaign reform is an oxymoron. But having said that, I am not going to take any more time of the Senate on this particular subject.

#### BOSNIA AND NATO ENLARGEMENT

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I want to talk about what is happening in re-

gard to mission creep in Bosnia and how that reflects on the hearings that will start very quickly in the Senate in regard to NATO expansion.

Mr. President, when President Woodrow Wilson exhorted Americans to make the world safe for democracy, he did not mean sending U.S. troops to attack foreign television stations and to attempt to try to shut down political speech in other countries. Yet that is exactly what happened last week in Bosnia as NATO troops, or SFOR troops, took over four television transmitters in an effort to control news broadcasts in that shattered region. State Department officials, in declaring victory, pledged to create a system "free of the monopolizing influence of political parties." Let me emphasize that again. Free the system—"free of the monopolizing influence of political parties." Then they set about the task of deciding what television content from United States networks might be appropriate for viewing by the citizens of Bosnia—content that is not "ethnically biased."

Wrote Lee Hockstader of the Washington Post:

As a result of the seizures of the TV towers, NATO generals and Western diplomats have cast themselves in the roles of media executives determined to construct an even-handed state television station in a country that has never had one. That represents a new level of involvement in Bosnia's affairs for the West \* \* \*

A new level of involvement indeed.

The trouble is, neither the American public nor Congress have been told by President Clinton just what our expectations are in Bosnia. What is our mission? How long will it last? How much will it cost? What will be accomplished? How do we extract out troops from the mess they are in?

None of these questions have been answered.

Is this war? If U.S. troops were involved in a war situation, we could expect media outlets to be military targets.

Is this war? If so, we can expect costs and casualties far beyond what the administration has projected.

Is this war? If so, what national security interests are at stake?

Is this war? If so, our troops cannot be expected to defend their lives with Nielsen ratings.

Mr. President, given this outlandish situation, we are tempted to treat these events as farce:

So when a television station in our home State gives a Senator a rough time, maybe we should call the Marines instead of the news director.

And certainly many Americans would agree they should not be bothered by the "monopolizing influence of political parties" during next year's campaign season.

Now we are back to campaign finance reform. But, Mr. President, Bosnia is serious business. Lives are at risk. Regional stability is on the line. We have serious obligations.

A few days ago Congress adopted an important amendment to the Defense appropriations bill, kindly referred to by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee as the "Roberts amendment." It requires the President to certify to Congress by May 15, 1998, that the continued presence of United States forces in Bosnia is in our national interest and why.

He must state the reasons for our deployment and the expected duration of deployment.

He must provide numbers of troops deployed, estimate the dollar cost involved, and give the effect of such deployment on overall effectiveness of U.S. forces.

Most importantly, the President must provide a clear statement of our mission and our objectives.

And he must provide an exit strategy for bringing our troops home.

If the President does not meet these conditions, funding for military deployment will end next May.

Following our actions against the television stations, Serbian officials warned there would be retaliation. And the New York Times reported that Bosnian Muslims are secretly arming themselves.

A senior NATO commander was quoted, "The question no longer is if the Muslims will attack the Bosnian Serbs, but when. The only way to prevent such an attack, at this point, is for the peacekeeping mission to extend its mandate."

Sound familiar. You bet it does.

Extend the mandate—that's mission creep by any name.

And it is the dangerous result of a policy that is lacking in direction, lacking in leadership and lacking in purpose.

The events of the last few days are alarming. They make it more urgent that the administration develop and articulate a course of action that is based on sound policy.

Taking over TV transmitters? Trying to figure out on an even basis what should be programmed, what the people of Bosnia should hear and listen to?

I suggested to one of my colleagues that if we had a choice of programs we should put "Gunsmoke," which is a favorite TV show of mine, on the Bosnian TV stations. I don't know what would be the opposing viewpoint. Maybe "Natural Born Killers" could be posed for some of the people who have been convicted or who have been indicted under the war crimes trials. Maybe in terms of programming we could decide on old newsreels of Tito. Maybe that would do some good.

This is incredible in terms of taking over the TV transmitters.

We need hard answers on Bosnia.

We need direction.

We don't need Nielsen ratings.

In that regard, I thank my colleague from Texas for bringing up this special time for us to consider how Bosnia also segues in our decision in regard to NATO expansion.

However, with all due respect to former Ambassador Richard Holbrook and Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, there is not much support for American military presence in Bosnia in Dodge City, KS, where "Gunsmoke" came from. Now, the question is, are the American people willing to commit to additional military responsibilities called for under article 5 of the NATO Charter, and at what cost? Will they support a commitment to the Czech Republic? How about Slovakia or Slovenia or perhaps Macedonia?

When I went over during the August break to visit our troops in Bosnia, our intelligence officials and others in that part of Central Europe, here came the folks from Macedonia wanting to be included in NATO expansion. Some 20 Senators, myself included, following the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Texas, asked that question and 10 others in a letter to the President prior to Madrid. With many Senators listed as skeptical or undecided, clearly I think the hard questions must be asked in full.

Simply put, to bring NATO expansion into focus, I think President Clinton must become engaged. In Warsaw, St. Petersburg, and in Bucharest, he addressed general European security concerns but he has not made a case to the Congress and to the American people. As a matter of fact, in remarks during his European trip, the President said in the post-Soviet era, military matters are no longer primary, that terrorism, illegal drugs, national extremism, regional conflicts due to ethnic, racial, and religious hatreds do matter. I can assure you using an expanded NATO to address these concerns raises more questions than answers.

What means would be used? Warplanes, ground forces, and naval power are of little use in fighting ethnic hatred and racism. If NATO membership reduces the threat of ethnic rivalries, somebody should tell that to the Protestants and Catholics of Northern Ireland, the Basques in Spain, and the Kurds in Turkey.

Do we really want to change the most successful security alliance in history to a European United Nations? With 16 NATO members and 28 other nations inaugurating the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, the protocol rituals and welcoming speeches left no time for any serious discussion. The meeting was over.

And, I must say while I understand the personal and emotional feelings that all freedom loving people feel when visiting Prague, Warsaw, and Budapest, I do not think NATO expansion will right the wrongs of Yalta nor do I agree that raising serious questions about NATO expansion represents the echoes of Munich as some in the administration have charged. To characterize serious critics as appeasers or isolationists sets needed debate off on entirely the wrong foot.

Let me emphasize my reservations are not a reflection on the potential

new members or their worthiness to join the alliance. I am extremely impressed with the success of the nations of Eastern Europe and their dramatic move toward democracy.

Let me share some of my major concerns.

Without argument NATO has been the most successful alliance in history. Likewise, most will agree that chief among the reasons for NATO's success is the fact that it is a military alliance comprised of like-minded nations focused against a common threat. As we know, in the past the security threat was the Soviet Union and the nations of the Warsaw Pact.

Today, however, that threat is vastly diminished—some would say gone. With the Warsaw Pact now history, there certainly is no clear threat to the survival of Europe on the horizon.

Certainly there are concerns for stability in Europe such as we have witnessed in Bosnia and in Albania. But do we need to fundamentally alter the structure of this very successful alliance to insure stability in Europe? Will the results of our actions be to turn a superb military alliance into a political alliance with diminished military capability? If we do, will NATO survive?

Let me stress we have vital interests in maintaining a healthy and stable Europe. That's not the question. Europe's continued peace is vital. But is enlargement of NATO necessary to achieve that goal?

#### WHY IT IS NECESSARY TO ENLARGE NATO?

The proponents state the reasons for enlargement include, preventing a power vacuum from developing in Eastern Europe and promoting total European stability by reducing in risk of instability in Europe's eastern half. The concern appears to be if NATO does not offer membership, the countries of Eastern Europe will founder, will not become fully developed Democratic states, or will become embroiled in ethnic or nationalistic disputes based on historic rivalries like we see in Bosnia. Worse, this theory holds, they will again become part, either voluntarily or forced, of an alliance with a resurgent Russia.

The Clinton administration has steadfastly maintained the position that a stable Europe will be no threat to Russia and in fact will increase the security of Russia. However, the Russians do not see it that way and have consistently stated they are opposed to NATO expansion for national security concerns.

Part of the "why enlarge NATO" question should be the timing of such an enlargement. Unfortunately, part of the motivation of the timing of this venture is to have the first new members join at the same time as the 50th anniversary of NATO. Let me say again, we are thinking about altering NATO, fundamentally realigning our relations with Europe, risking our resources and committing our military for questionable national interests and

basing the timing of such an important event on the 50th anniversary of NATO.

Mr. President, that is public relations. It is not foreign policy.

What are the alternatives to NATO enlargement? Perhaps an enhanced Partnership for Peace would provide the desired stability and military security in Eastern Europe instead of membership in NATO. Perhaps membership in the European Union, coupled with Partnership for Peace, would allow continued development of Democratic systems in Eastern European nations. Those alternatives should be part of the national debate.

Let's take a look at the cost of all of this. What are the costs of NATO enlargement? I am concerned with the widely varying values and assumptions used to arrive at the U.S. portions of the bill for enlargement. Since the Madrid Summit, it is clear that our allies are not on board for sharing costs of enlargement. Until this plan for sharing is established and agreed to, how can we know what our actual costs will be and why we should proceed? If our allies refuse to carry what we feel is their fair share, given our defense responsibilities, will the United States pay more? And, if so, asking American taxpayers to up the ante would be most difficult.

Just as we have seen in the Bosnian operation, unexpected funding for DOD has directly affected the much-needed military modernization and procurement programs. Why should we be willing to risk the future of our military capability in defending our vital national interests by rushing into NATO enlargement without confidently knowing, in great detail, the costs associated with the enlargement and what our allies and the new members will and are capable of funding.

What will be the Russian reaction to NATO enlargement? Mr. President, just yesterday Susan Eisenhower and several distinguished foreign policy experts came to the Senate and testified before myself and Senator SESSIONS and Senator COLLINS and Senator STEVENS and others as to why they felt NATO enlargement was the wrong step at the wrong time.

The most important concern that must be well understood is the reaction of the Government of Russia to the enlargement of NATO. If we get this wrong, the need for enlargement will be self-fulfilling and we will again need a strong military alliance facing east. We are in danger of awakening the Russian bear, not taming him and putting him in a cage.

Aleksei Arbatov, the deputy chairman of the Russian Parliament's defense committee, was recently quoted as saying that the way in which an expanded NATO was imposed on the Russians "was a shock for those trying to improve relations." He added there "was a widespread feeling of betrayal among Russian Democrats."

Mr. Arbatrov predicted Russia could turn to a strategy of first-strike nuclear capability to combat what is perceived as a NATO threat on its doorstep.

"There is no chance whatsoever" that Russia's Parliament would ratify START II or START III, Mr. Arbatrov said.

I know that the Russians have joined the Partnership for Peace, signed the Founding Act, and have been officially quiet, semiquiet, about three potential new NATO members. However, there can be no doubt that all factions of the Russian political system are opposed to the expansion. What they see is a military alliance moving eastward, ever closer to their borders.

We cannot allow Russia to dictate our actions or the actions of NATO. Let that be perfectly clear. But it would be most dangerous to embark on such an important foreign policy matter as NATO enlargement without fully understanding or accounting for the Russian concerns. That is what Susan Eisenhower stated. That is what the other foreign experts stated.

Why are the Baltic States and NATO such a sensitive issue to Russia? There are at least two reasons. Addition of the Baltics would move NATO's borders to Russia, and a section of Russian territory, including the city of Kaliningrad, would be completely surrounded by NATO.

When asked about the Russian reaction to the addition of the Baltics to NATO, the Russian Ambassador to the United States said "the reaction would be fierce." Even with this understanding of the potential reaction by Russia, the administration continues to insist the Baltic States are likely to be asked to join in the next round.

I remain concerned we are approaching the Russian issue, Mr. President, with much bravado and arrogance with our fingers crossed behind our back.

Although I consider these three areas—why enlarge? what is the cost? and what will be the reaction of Russia?—to be the most critical, there are other areas of significant importance that must be part of the debate, Mr. President. I look forward to discussing these three and the others in detail in the coming months. NATO enlargement is the most important foreign policy and military decision the United States will make or has made for many years. We must make the right decision.

And again, Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas for leading the charge in asking the right questions, the complex questions that must be asked before the Senate considers either in committee or in the Chamber later the ratification of NATO.

Mr. President, may I ask how much time I have consumed of the 25 minutes that was yielded to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has spoken for approximately 20 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS. If I might, I would just like to touch, I would tell the distinguished Senator from Texas, on a related matter, if I could, for another, say, 2 or 3 minutes, if I might.

What I would like to talk about is the reaction in regards to how the American people feel about this. It is the American public that must be fully informed and aware of what responsibilities NATO will entail and what expansion would mean to our American men and women in uniform.

What about the American public? Last April, the Roper Starch worldwide poll asked Americans the level of support for using armed forces in certain situations. I don't think the American people are isolationist, but I think there is understandable concern about risking American lives in political wars of gradualism.

The Senator from Texas went to Bosnia, Brcko, took a look at Tuzla and Sarajevo, and is very concerned about mission creep and again repeating the past mistakes in political wars of gradualism.

The American public understands that. If the United States were attacked, 84 percent of those polled supported using force—84 percent if we were attacked. I don't know about the other 16 percent. If our forces stationed overseas were attacked, 50 percent supported armed intervention. To safeguard peacekeeping within the framework of the United Nations, the support dropped to 35 percent. Hello. And to stop an invasion of one country by another, which is called for in article V in regard to NATO expansion, the support fell sharply to 15 percent.

I took my own poll. It was after the Dodge City Rodeo in August. I met with the Ford County, KS, wheat growers. They are good friends of mine, long-time friends and constituents. I told them I was going to the Czech Republic, Bosnia, and Hungary. The price of wheat depended in part on world trade and security. The heads nodded. But in that particular case, I tell my distinguished friend and colleague from Texas, there wasn't much support until we took a hard look in regard to Bosnia and to NATO enlargement. As a matter of fact, one farmer said, "My son is over there. He is a foreign linguist in the National Guard unit over there. He should be back." So I think we really need to demonstrate not only to the Ford County, KS, wheat growers but to all Americans as evidenced by this poll what are our vital national security interests in regards to NATO expansion and answer those tough questions about cost, what happens in relation to Russia and what happens in terms of the long-term best interests of our foreign policy.

Again, I thank the Senator from Texas and I yield the floor.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Before the distinguished Senator from Kansas leaves

the floor, I do appreciate so much this Senator's leadership on the issue of Bosnia and the issue of NATO expansion because he is one of the Senators who has taken the time to go to Bosnia, to look firsthand at the conditions there to determine what is in the United States security interests and certainly the best interests of the people of Bosnia.

I would just like to ask the Senator from Kansas before he yields the floor to tell me and the American people about the experience that he had in the resettlement-of-refugees issue.

What did the Senator see with his own eyes that brought him to the same conclusion that I have come to, that we are barking up the wrong tree in putting U.S. troops in harm's way before the people of this country have come to a settlement themselves?

Mr. ROBERTS. I would be happy to respond to my colleague.

As my colleague knows, I have discussed at length the original purpose of the Bosnia mission was to safeguard our troops—that is, the peacekeeping role—and to try to do what we can in regard to technology restoration, to nation building, to the possibility of the location and capture and prosecution of war criminals and then refugee resettlement.

In response to the Senator's question, it is that part of the goal that is especially difficult. Now, I think we have come from peacekeeping to peace enforcement. I think we have come far afield from the original goal in that we are now disarming the police in regard to Mr. Karadzic's troops, and I think in regard to what I am able to understand from our intelligence community we are aggressively going to locate, capture and proceed with war criminals.

Now, as I have just indicated, we have a situation where the SFOR troops have taken over TV transmitters. So I think the Senator from Texas makes a good point in terms of mission creep.

But in answer to the specific question, flying in the helicopter with a one-star over there from Tuzla where our American forces have their headquarters, we went over a small hill, and on the knoll of the hill there used to be 60 Muslim families that lived there, and during the fighting since 1993 there was tremendous bloodshed, there were atrocities very close by, and obviously that particular piece of real estate is not inhabited any more by the Muslims. So there was an attempt by SFOR and by NATO to relocate these refugees on that hill.

Three times they tried it. The first time, with 60 people, they tried to relocate on the hill, they were driven away by rocks and stones and shouts and intimidation by the Serbs in that area. The second time they tried, it got a little tougher. We were also involved in the building of new homes, in terms of financing those new homes. Then you got into some home destruction.

Well, the third time, they were met by an angry crowd with 2x4's. They

burned the homes down. And we have pictures of them attacking the Muslims, the 60 people we were trying to relocate, with 2x4's. And I asked the one star, I asked the general, "Are we going to try it again?" He said, "No, I don't think that's a very good investment of our tax dollars or our time and effort." I think we got the message. He suggested if we have successful refugee relocation, we should do it in Brcko. The Senator from Texas has been there, and I ask her now what her observation was about how that refugee resettlement effort is going. And I thank her for asking the question.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the Senator from Kansas. I thank him for taking the time to go over there, to look firsthand, because I think you get a very different perspective when you are able to do that. I appreciate the leadership position the Senator from Kansas is taking. I will just say that I had a different experience walking on the streets of Brcko in August. But I came to the same conclusion, after going into the home of a Serb, going into the street and talking to a Muslim who was just resettling into the neighborhood where that person had lived before. I asked each individually, "Are you working with your neighbor to help them resettle into their homes?"

I asked the Serb about the Muslim. "Oh, no, no. We are not doing that because we know that they are occupied and they have their own problems. We wouldn't want to disturb them."

So then you ask the Muslim, "Have you met your Serb neighbor? Have you had a chance to visit or have coffee with your Serb neighbor?" And the answer was, "Oh, no, no, we actually haven't. We have not been able to do that."

These are people who are living in homes that are 5 feet from each other, 10 feet. The streets are very narrow. Yet, they are not mixing.

I think we have to look at the big picture here. American people are very generous. We want to help the people of Bosnia. But I think what we are trying to do is help them in a way that will provide a long-term peace, an economic stability. And doing things that are inherently unpeaceful, putting our U.S. troops in harm's way, I don't think is the right answer. That is why I am saying let's go back to the table at Dayton. Let's determine where we are.

I will give this administration a lot of credit for keeping the parties apart, for trying to forge a peace. Now I ask this administration to say we have had 2 years of Dayton, let's assess it. Let's see if this is the right direction. Because I don't think it is.

We have witnessed elections in which the people who come in to vote come in under armed guard, they vote, they leave under armed guard. We have elected Muslims who cannot even enter the city to take control of the government to which they are elected to serve. We have elected Serbs, where they are not able to reenter. We are de-

claring victory. I am missing something. We have elected governments that cannot serve, that cannot even enter the cities in which they were elected. And we are declaring this to be a victory? I think we need to have a reality check.

That brings me to the bigger context of NATO expansion and cost, and just how much should the United States absorb when we are talking about issues where we want to be helpful but we want to make sure that our money is going toward a successful endeavor. That is where, I think, this administration is not being realistic.

Take the idea of NATO expansion. I think all of us in this country believe that NATO is the best alliance that has ever been put forward on the face of the Earth. Because of its strength, it never had to fire a shot and the cold war was ended. Now we are looking at expanding NATO and the hearings are starting this week to do that very thing. I think the questions that Senator HELMS is asking are the very important questions that must be answered if we are going to expand NATO in a responsible way and in a way that sets a base for a long-term stability in Europe.

Senator HELMS is not saying I am for a NATO expansion period. He is saying I am for NATO expansion if it is done right. The "if it is done right" seems to be lopped off and not given very much attention. I think it is time the administration gave the "if it is done right" portion of Senator HELMS' statement its due. Because if it is done right, it will continue to be the greatest alliance that was ever formed on the face of this Earth. And if it is done wrong, it will be the unraveling of the greatest alliance that was ever put on the face of the Earth.

So we have the choice, of whether to keep NATO strong and stable by expanding responsibly or whether we just expand willy-nilly. America will absorb all the costs, and then the American people will say, wait a minute, I don't intend to completely prop up Europe without a fair share taken by our allies in Europe.

That question becomes very important because just this last week in the Washington Post there was a report on the meeting of NATO defense ministers at which our own Secretary of Defense, William Cohen, participated. The reporter for the Washington Post says that this was, in fact, a startling meeting because the NATO defense ministers voiced serious misgivings about the United States insistence that they, along with the new members to be brought into NATO, would carry the bulk of the expenses related to NATO enlargement.

You see, President Clinton has told the American Congress that the American share would be \$2 billion over 10 years—\$200 million. That is something I think American taxpayers would willingly absorb. But there is a lot of disagreement about those numbers be-

cause, in fact, we do not know what is in the requirements for NATO expansion. So, to have numbers before you have requirements is the cart before the horse in most people's books.

The European allies said that they did not think it was right for America to take \$2 billion of the \$35 billion which the Clinton administration estimates NATO expansion will cost, and they are objecting to paying \$16 billion from the present membership. In fact, the ministers from Germany, France, Great Britain, and the Netherlands expressed dismay and insisted that the burdensharing debate must be viewed in a wider context.

You see, Secretary Cohen was right. He said the right things. He said that any shortchanging on defense investments by existing members or new partners would lead to a hollow alliance and ultimately erode confidence in future rounds of enlargement. Secretary Cohen is sending up the red flag of warning because he, too, is saying, do it right.

Let's look at the amount of gross domestic product that is spent by NATO members. The United States spends 3.8 percent of gross domestic product on defense. This is 3.8 percent of the domestic product of our country, the whole domestic product. The United Kingdom spends 3.1 percent, Germany spends 1.5 percent, France spends 2.5 percent. And they are saying they are not going to spend any more than that.

So I think we need to be forewarned that our European allies are not committing to the same numbers that the United States is. I think we have to put that in perspective. Because General Shalikashvili, who just left the chairmanship of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was lamenting the fact that we don't have enough money in our defense budget to properly train our troops for peak readiness. He says we don't have enough money to buy parts or equipment. Yet, we are spending \$3 billion a year, on average, in Bosnia, pursuing a policy that has yet to be defined, with no exit strategy and with the administration now saying it is probable that we are going to extend the troops with no defined end when he has already extended the mission nearly 2 years beyond the first limit that he set.

Let's take another example. Just yesterday the President vetoed almost \$300 million of military construction in the United States. He vetoed such operational projects as a corrosion control facility, headquarters facilities that would enhance command, control and communications, ammunition storage facilities—\$300 million in America. At the same time, he approved the expenditure of military construction in Europe for NATO enhancement of over \$150 million. What kinds of projects did he approve for NATO? Ammunition storage facilities, administrative buildings—the exact same things he vetoed for military construction in the United States, for our bases, for our readiness.

So I do have a problem when the outgoing chairman of the Joint Chiefs

says we are not spending enough for our own readiness, for our own military personnel, when the President vetoes military construction which was in the Defense Department's 5-year plan, saying these were not priorities, while at the same time signing military construction of \$150 million in Europe for NATO enhancement.

So, I have to say the issue of our own readiness is a key issue here. If we are going to spend \$3 billion in Bosnia for a policy that has, I think, minimal chance to succeed and the outgoing Chairman of the Joint Chiefs is saying we don't have enough money for our own readiness, what are we doing as the stewards of this country, as the ones responsible for our own national defense, our readiness, our troop morale, our quality of life for our troops, our taxpayers, and, most of all, for our own security threats, when we would veto our own military construction and put half that same amount into European construction? And when we know that we are not spending enough to keep our troops ready for the eventual real threat to the United States that could come from an incoming ballistic missile, for which we do not have the defense; from a terrorist nation that would do any kind of bombing of our own people, either on our shores or off? Are we building up for the potential threat in Korea, in the Middle East?

I just have to ask the administration to think about these issues as we look at our own situation and our readiness and our strength. Are we doing everything we should for our own troops, for our own military construction, for our own quality of life for our men and women who are serving in the military? Or are we dissipating our resources in operations that are not defined, that have no exit strategy, in places like Bosnia and Somalia and Haiti?

I would just ask the question, Do we have our priorities straight? When we look at the issue of NATO expansion, we must look at the cost. It must be nailed down. It must not be a moving target. It must be clear. And we must tell our European allies exactly what we will do, and not be badgered into taking more than our fair share of the cost of European security. We do want to step up to the line. We do want to be the major superpower in the world, and fulfill our responsibilities. But we are already spending more of our gross domestic product on national defense than our European allies spend. I think the American taxpayer has the right to ask the question: Are we spending the dollars for our own security? Are we doing our fair share for the humanitarian needs of this country, and for the countries that we are trying to help? Are we spending the dollars wisely? That is the question.

I think as we move toward NATO expansion, we must be good and responsible stewards for the American taxpayer, and, more important, we must be good and responsible stewards of the

national defense of our country. We must meet the test, for our young men and women in the military who have pledged their lives to preserve our freedom, that our commitment to them is commensurate with their commitment to the United States; that we will guard them with respect, with a quality of life that allows them and their families to live with a high standard of living, and that we will make sure that wherever they are, in the field or on our shores, that they have everything they need to do their job.

I think if we are going to keep that commitment to them and to the American people, we must ask the questions about NATO expansion, about our mission in Bosnia: Are we spending the dollars wisely and are we assured that when we put our United States troops on the ground that there is a United States security threat and risk that requires that action?

Mr. President, those are the questions that I hope Senator HELMS, in his hearings this week on NATO expansion, will focus on and not allow fuzzy, vague, moving-target answers from the administration. The American people and our young men and women in the service deserve no less than total responsibility and total answers to those questions.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield back the remainder of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized to speak in morning business for such time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 10 minutes, under the previous order.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, the Finance Committee recently approved fast-track authority for the President. I thought I might come to the floor and express some of my very serious concerns about this proposal.

Let me begin by saying to those who would paint every Member of Congress who has a problem with the fast track proposal with some broad brush calling us protectionists or xenophobic. I, for one, am not.

Trade is very important to my State. California is the seventh largest economy on Earth, and we produce 20 percent of the Nation's exports. Exports are one of the largest growing economic sectors in my State. More than 1 million jobs in California are directly related to trade, and that number is growing. So I see free and fair trade as an integral part of California's economic future, and it is my responsibility as a U.S. Senator representing that State to see that the concerns and

issues and industries of my State are protected in agreements, or at least as nearly as I can do so.

As I see it, America already has the most open markets in the world, but the problem is that this openness isn't reciprocated by many of our trading partners, and that brings us to the present situation.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution gives Members of this body constitutional responsibility for matters of trade and the economy. Fast track is essentially a surrendering, an abrogation, of those constitutional responsibilities provided to this body by the Constitution of the United States. I, for one, see no reason why we should surrender that.

Essentially, fast track is simply the ability of the administration to negotiate a trade agreement, then bring it quickly to the Congress, get it ratified within a specific period of time, without congressional opportunity to amend it in any way, shape, or form.

The administration claims that fast track authority is needed to keep our economy growing strong, to allow our companies to compete with those of the European Union and Japan in growing markets such as South America and the Pacific Rim and to maintain America's symbolic commitment to free trade by letting the President negotiate agreements without fear that Congress is going to mettle in any of the details.

In my view, that argument flies in the face of reality. Since President Clinton has taken office, 220 trade agreements have been negotiated with foreign nations. Only two of those required fast track.

In recent years, U.S. exports have been the strength of the economy. U.S. exports increased 50 percent since 1991 without fast track. Today, exports are 30 percent higher than in 1993.

According to trade data released by the International Monetary Fund, United States exports to Brazil, South America's richest market, grew 56 percent from 1994 to 1995. During that same period, the European Union's exports to Brazil grew only 8 percent, while Japan's exports grew only 18 percent. This growth in U.S. exports has occurred without fast track authority. As a recent Wall Street Journal article citing the IMF data, pointed out, U.S. exporters hardly seem handicapped without fast track.

So arguments that the United States cannot negotiate trade agreements without fast track I think are specious. Further, to argue that without fast track the United States risks losing the jobs that come with robust trade begs the question of how previous fast-track agreements have fared in this regard.

Once again, I did not vote for NAFTA, but NAFTA was my first experience with fast track. Once spurned, hopefully twice learned. Under NAFTA, the United States \$1.7 billion trade surplus with Mexico in 1993 became a

record trade deficit of \$16.3 billion by 1996. The balance of trade has gone exactly the wrong way.

Our balance of trade with Canada has also grown, more than doubling from \$11 billion to \$23 billion annually.

Let us look at GATT, another important trade agreement. The GATT agreement has contributed to the largest merchandise trade deficit in U.S. history. Today, it is at an all-time high of \$165 billion.

I think these experiences combine to present an eloquent statement that says: Go slow. Fast track may well backfire. In the future it may not be as desirable as some claim.

If we look at the currency problems in certain southeast Asian countries, we can identify some of their trade strategies. I think what happens, as a result of some of the financial problems, is these countries push for more exports to our country and they close their markets to our products. This is a very real danger signal for the future. I think it indicates that as a nation we should go slow. We need to be very careful and deliberate in these negotiations.

The Commerce Department estimates that every \$1 billion in exports equals between 14,000 and 15,000 jobs. Based on that calculation alone, the United States has lost hundreds of thousands of jobs as a result of these trade deficits. The administration claims a modest increase in U.S. net exports as a result of NAFTA, but the jury is still out.

These mounting trade deficits should be a loud and clear message that America should negotiate better trade deals, rather than give up congressional responsibility through fast track.

The bottom line is that Members of Congress are being asked to forfeit our ability to offer amendments to any trade agreement with no guarantee that the major industries of our States will not be disadvantaged by those agreements. Under fast track, Congress is left with no recourse except to vote against the whole agreement.

The President tried to address some of these concerns in the proposal he sent to Congress. But the goals and objectives of the President's fast track proposal are still just that—goals and objectives. Previous fast track agreements have demonstrated why this is just not good enough.

For me, a Californian, NAFTA was a big case in point:

NAFTA had an immediate negative impact on the California wine industry. The California wine industry produces 90 percent of our Nation's wine and 90 percent of the wine exported by the United States.

Coincident with NAFTA, Mexico gave Chilean wines an immediate tariff reduction from 20 percent to 8 percent and a guarantee of duty-free status within a year. By contrast, United States wines face a 10-year phaseout of a much higher Mexican tariff, leaving U.S. wines at a significant disadvan-

tage in the Mexican market. It is actually a wipeout of our market share of wine in Mexico.

The result of this tariff inequity was predictable. Exports of all U.S. wines to Mexico have dropped by one-third since NAFTA went into effect, while Chilean wine exports to Mexico have nearly doubled. The size of the Chilean gains virtually match the size of U.S. losses. Chilean wine picked up the market share lost by the U.S. wineries, dominated by California.

During the NAFTA debate in Congress, the administration pledged to correct these tariff inequities within 120 days of NAFTA's approval. Let me quote from a letter to Members of Congress from then U.S. Trade Representative Mickey Kantor dated November 8, 1993:

Pursuant to your request, you have my personal commitment that, within 120 days of the coming into force of NAFTA, I will personally negotiate the immediate reduction of Mexican tariffs on US wines to the level of Mexican tariffs on Chilean wines and, thereafter, have them fall parallel with future reductions in such tariffs.

I personally talked with Mr. Kantor at least three or four times on this issue. I also talked with the President, as well as others in the White House. This was a glaring discrepancy, and the whole administration made a commitment to correct the discrepancy.

You would think that at least by today, 3 years later, the tariffs would be parallel. But 3½ years later, these inequities remain enshrined in the agreement. As a matter of fact, as the result of an unrelated trade dispute, Mexico actually raised tariffs on United States wine back up to pre-NAFTA levels of 20 percent, increasing the tariff from the 14 percent it had reached under NAFTA. Rather than drop to zero within 10 years, the tariff is now 20 percent, a wipeout for an American market share.

Another product of fast track, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, known as GATT, also contained monumental inequities that seriously disadvantaged California's wine industry. Prior to the Uruguay round of GATT, major wine competitors had wine tariffs that were almost four times the United States tariff on an ad valorem basis.

But, even though the United States had the lowest tariffs of any major wine producer, United States negotiators agreed in the Uruguay round to drop United States tariffs by 36 percent over 6 years, while the world's largest wine producer, the EU, dropped its tariffs by 10 percent. As a result, the current U.S. tariff on all wine products is an average of 2.4 percent. That is far lower than the EU's current average tariff of 13 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If I may, the Senator's 10 minutes have expired.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I would like to finish this.

Mr. GRAMM. I ask that the Senator have an additional 2 minutes.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Pardon me?

Mr. GRAMM. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator have an additional 2 minutes, if that would solve the problem.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I accept that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. If I do not finish it, I will perhaps get on the queue and come back later. I thank the Senator from Texas. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I have some very specific concerns about fast track that are not adequately addressed in the current proposal.

First, tariff inequities: As I said, the United States is already the most open market in the world. But our trade agreements have sometimes disadvantaged American industries by not requiring a level playing field with other nations. All too often, the price of modest tariff reductions elsewhere has been further reductions in the already low U.S. tariffs.

Any future agreements should require that other countries meet our tariff level before we agree to lower our tariffs further. Any fast-track proposal would have to address this issue before winning my support.

There should also be stronger enforcement mechanisms included when trade barriers are not lowered as provided for in an agreement. Half the problems with previous trade agreements have stemmed from nonenforcement. A recent report from the American Chamber of Commerce in Japan said more effort must be dedicated to enforcing existing agreements.

For example, Europe simply did not accept the GATT commitments on audio visual services, instead, maintaining its 1989 European Union Broadcast Directive. This EU directive limits the market for U.S. movies and TV broadcasting.

Another example is an agreement signed with China in May of this year which grants the United States access to Chinese markets for table grapes. However, despite the agreement, China maintains a 55 percent tariff on United States table grapes, presenting a significant barrier to United States exports.

Second, phytosanitary standards:

In addition to tariff inequities, disagreements over phytosanitary standards continue, and are often used as de facto trade barriers. For example: Japan's stringent tests for pesticides on American nectarines, cherries, and other fruit continues to deny market access for United States products.

Another example is Chile: The United States imported 1 billion trays of fresh vegetables from Chile during the 1996-97 growing year, while the United States exported no similar products to Chile during its growing year—why?—because of Chile's phytosanitary restrictions on imports of United States poultry, fruit, and vegetables, which



has effectively banned all imports of these goods.

The President's fast track proposal—section 2(b)(6)(C)(iii)—states that unjustified phytosanitary restrictions should be eliminated, but there is no language requiring that scientifically based standards be established before a trade agreement can be signed.

Third, dispute resolution: The previous free trade agreement with Canada, and the NAFTA agreement, established a process for resolving disputes. But the process does not always work. For example:

California growers have complained in the past about Mexican inspectors being unavailable at the border, so shipments are delayed.

There is also no timely method of solving a dispute within a matter of hours. This is important when perishable goods are sitting at a border or a port warehouse awaiting a decision.

A bigger problem now is that if a Mexican inspector finds a pest and does not know whether that pest is subject to quarantine, it reportedly takes a week for the inspector to find out. No shipper can leave fruit sitting at the border for a week.

In January of last year, Mexico shipped over 8,000 boxes of brussels sprouts to the United States market causing the price to drop literally in half. This product dumping caused the price to drop to a level from which the brussel sprout industry could not recover during that season.

The dispute resolution process needs to be strengthened to include a mechanism for swift resolution—within 48 hours—when a dispute involves perishable commodities.

Fourth, environmental standards: I agree with many of my colleagues that we should not encourage a race to the bottom, in which the country with the weakest environmental protection wins the prize of economic growth.

We all know that pollution knows no geographic boundaries. U.S. commitment to preserving the quality of our environment should be as vigorous as our commitment to open markets, and that commitment should be reflected in our trade agreements to the greatest extent possible.

For example, large numbers of American companies have located in Mexico. The pollution from these companies goes into the New River, which flows north into the United States, terminating at the Salton Sea. I have flown over the New River, and I have seen first hand the extent of the pollution which is killing the Salton Sea. No companies in the United States can do what is being done in Mexicali.

Also, Mexican farmers have access to pesticides and other chemicals that are not available to American growers. These disparities will only increase as we enforce our own laws.

California growers will soon face an uneven playing field regarding the use of methyl bromide, a widely used soil and post-harvest fumigant. Under the

Clean Air Act, the United States is phasing out the use of methyl bromide by 2001, but our trading partners will continue to use the chemical. Moreover, many of our trading partners require our growers to fumigate their crops with methyl bromide before the commodity is shipped.

U.S. requirements to control particulate matter will add costs to U.S. producers, while no comparable requirements are being imposed on many of our trading partners.

Our trade agreements should encourage our trading partners to live up to the highest environmental standards, not put added pressure on American companies to lower our standards.

Fifth, manufacturing base and labor standards: I also share the concern raised by many of my Democratic colleagues that we need to be particularly careful to protect our manufacturing base, and not undermine labor standards, as we negotiate new trade agreements.

At one point, California was home to six automobile manufacturing plants, but today we are reduced to one. Once we lose our manufacturing capacity, I am very concerned it will be very difficult if not impossible to reclaim.

Akio Morita, the chairman of Sony, made a blunt assessment of the situation: he said America will cease to be a world power if it loses its manufacturing base. I wholeheartedly agree.

Service jobs, like energy and transportation services—which have fueled much of my State's economic rebound—are important, but can't compensate for the loss of higher-wage manufacturing jobs in this country. And if we lose our manufacturing base, we lose the service jobs, technology advances, and innovation that go with it.

U.S. manufacturers already face enormous pressure to relocate manufacturing capability abroad to meet the regulatory and competitive demands of foreign nations.

The Semiconductor Industry Association, representing the makers of computer chips, says 30 percent of their investment abroad is due to chipmakers' desire to avoid high tariffs or meet a foreign government's requirement that manufacturing be done in their country, in order to sell in an otherwise closed market.

For example: China's \$3 billion semiconductor market is growing rapidly. But they have a closed market, imposing high tariffs unless the manufacturer builds a plant in their country.

This is a \$132 billion worldwide market and is expected to reach \$245 billion market by the year 2000. California is the Nation's leading chip producing State, so this is enormously important to my State.

U.S. trade agreements must aggressively tear down the trade restrictions that force U.S. manufacturers overseas.

U.S. manufacturers often cannot compete with foreign countries on wage costs.

One of the arguments advanced by NAFTA supporters was the expansion of trade will boost the economies of our trading partners—and theoretically their wages—and expand the demand for our products in return. However, based on our NAFTA experience, the theory has not materialized.

According to the Labor Department, the wage gap between United States and Mexico workers is widening, rather than narrowing. In 1993, Mexican wages were 15 percent of those in the United States. Today, they are 8 percent.

This decline in wages is not solely the effect of the Mexican peso crisis. In 1994—before the peso collapse—real hourly wages in Mexico had already dropped to nearly 30 percent below their 1980 level—UC-Berkeley sociologist Harley Shaiken.

Mexico's financial problems only exacerbated the trend. Since 1994, real wages in Mexico have dropped another 25 percent to roughly half their 1980 level.

Clearly, NAFTA has not yet improved the wages of Mexican labor.

Conclusion: Any fast track legislation must contain the following assurances:

There must be a mechanism for swift and effective dispute resolutions.

There must be language included stipulating that any agreement negotiated under fast track must set equal tariffs between the United States and our trading partners before the United States agrees to lower tariffs further.

There must be mandatory mutual acceptance of scientifically-sound phytosanitary standards.

There must be enforceable environmental standards in place.

And there must be labor and wage provisions, and aggressive reduction of trade barriers, to protect our manufacturing future.

Without these assurances written into the bill, I am very concerned that extension of fast track authority would give away, once again, the only ability I have as a U.S. Senator to influence trade agreements to see that they are responsive to the concerns of my State and important industries.

Until these concerns are addressed, Mr. President, I must oppose any extension of fast-track authority.

#### CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the motion to invoke cloture on S. 25, the McCain-Feingold campaign finance reform bill.

Throughout my years in Congress, I have supported efforts to reform campaign finance laws. I have, for example, voted to eliminate political action committees and to prohibit the use of the congressional franking privilege for mass mailings.

Along with Senators GREGG, TORRICELLI, and JOHNSON, I am cosponsoring in this Congress legislation to establish a bipartisan commission that